

REMARKS

Summary

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed on April 7, 2004. Claims 1, 6-9, 20, 32, 37-40, and 51 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 6-20, 22-28, 30-33, 37-51, 53-59, and 61-64 are pending.

Claims 63 and 64 are allowed. The Examiner has indicated that claims 9 and 40 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 11-13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacquin (US 5,764,803).

Claims 25, 32, 33, 42-44, 46-48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Maeng (US 6,476,873).

Claims 6, 8-10, 37, 39-41, 63, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garland in view of Stark (US 6,389,169).

Claims 24, 27, 55, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Maeng and "Lossy/Lossless Region-of-Interest Coding Based on Set of Partitioning in Hierarchical Trees" by Atsumi.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Krishnamurthy (US 6,256,423).

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view in view of Maeng and Krishnamurthy.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Garland (US 6,144,772).

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Maeng and Garland.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Das (US 5,896,176).

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Maeng and Das.

Claims 6, 8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Stark (US 6,389,169).

Claims 37, 39, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view of Maeng and Stark.

Claims 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view Dunn (US 6,356,664).

Claims 61 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacquin in view Maeng and Dunn.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the amended claims and the following comments.

Discussion of Amended Claims

The claims are amended herein to include the allowable subject matter of claims 9 and 40. In particular, independent claims 1 and 32 are amended to include the

allowable subject matter of claims 9 and 40, respectively. Claims 1 and 32 are also amended by deleting certain subject matter that is not related to the allowable subject matter indicated by the Examiner. In particular, claim 1 is amended to delete the step of extrapolating areas of interest from the identified areas of interest. Claim 32 is also amended accordingly. This subject matter is now included in amended claims 8 and 39, respectively.

Dependent claims 6, 7, and 9 are amended to conform to the amendments made to claim 1. Dependent claims 37, 38, and 40 are amended to conform to the amendments made to claim 32.

Independent claims 20 and 51 are amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 9 and 40, respectively.

Claims 63 and 64 have been allowed by the Examiner.

Therefore, each of the currently pending claims now contains allowable subject matter or depends from a claim containing allowable subject matter. Applicants submit that the claims are now in condition for immediate allowance.

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicants' claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended claims and the foregoing discussion. Applicants' silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Withdrawal of the rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application, allow each of the pending claims and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. McAllister
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 37,886
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: MGI-171

Date: June 15, 2004